

JAN 11 1949

9
**THE
CLASSICAL WEEKLY**

VOL. 42, NO. 7

JANUARY 10, 1949

WHOLE NO. 1093

SHELLEY AND THE SYMPOSIUM OF PLATO (*Notopoulos*)

THE CLASSICS IN COLLEGE (*Johnson*)

HORACE, SATIRES 1. 1. 86-91 (*Stevens*)

REFLECTIONS OF HISTORY IN THE DECLAMATIONS (*Rayment*)

EXPLORING THE WINDS WITH THE FACE (*McCartney*)

THE CASE OF LATIN ON APPEAL (*Finney*)

REVIEW

Ehrenberg, Aspects of the Ancient World (*Weddeck*)

Latin and World Peace

The war proved the importance of language study, and the parent language, Latin, has profited because the sales of Latin books have increased.

The following well-tested Series covers the best recommendations for the high school course in Latin.

FIRST YEAR LATIN by Smith-Thompson

LATIN WORKBOOK by Thompson-Peters

SECOND YEAR LATIN by Scudder

THIRD YEAR LATIN by Kelsey-Meinecke

FOURTH YEAR LATIN by Carlisle-Richardson

CLASSICAL MYTHS by Herzberg

All of these textbooks are of handy size convenient for carrying home for study. The color work is beautiful and accurate.

ALLYN AND BACON

Boston

New York

Chicago

Atlanta

Dallas

San Francisco

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

Volume 42 contains issues dated: October 4, 18; November 1, 15; December 6, 20 (1948); January 10, 24; February 7, 21; March 7, 21; April 4, 18; May 2, 16 (1949).

Published semi-monthly from October to May inclusive by The Classical Association of the Atlantic States. Place of Publication: Bennett Hall, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia 4, Pennsylvania. Printed by Business Press, Inc., Lancaster, Pa.

Edward H. Heffner, Editor, Bennett Hall, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia 4, Pennsylvania.

Franklin B. Krauss, Secretary and Treasurer, The Pennsylvania State College, Box 339, State College, Pennsylvania.

Associate Editors, Wm. C. McDermott (for Book Reviews), University of Pennsylvania, Bernice V. Wall (for materials for secondary-school teachers), Taft Junior High School, Washington, D. C.

Contributing Editor, Donald W. Prakken, Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pennsylvania.

General subscription price: \$3.00 per volume in the Western Hemisphere; elsewhere \$3.50. Price to members of the C.A.A.S.: \$2.50. All subscriptions run by the volume. Single numbers: to subscribers 20 cents, to others 30 cents prepaid (otherwise 30 cents and 40 cents). If affidavit to invoice is required, sixty cents must be added to the subscription price. For residents of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, or the District of Columbia, a subscription to THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY (or, alternatively, to The Classical Journal) is included in the membership fee of The Classical Association of the Atlantic States, whose members are also entitled to The Classical Outlook and The Classical Journal at special prices in combinations available from the Secretary.

Entered as second-class matter November 7, 1945, at the Post Office at Philadelphia, Pa., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in the Act of February 28, 1925, authorized October 14, 1938.

SHELLEY AND THE SYMPOSIUM OF PLATO¹

We are all familiar with the element of revolt in English romanticism. What is neglected by the historians of classical scholarship is the significance of the Romantic movement in the history of the Platonic tradition. The neglect of Plato in England during the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries is striking. It was not until 1847 that Plato appears in the Oxford *Literae Humaniores*.² Thomas Gray deplored the neglect of Plato in Cambridge.³ The only good thing which the *Edinburgh Review* had to say of Thomas Taylor, the translator of Plato, was that he undertook 'to elucidate for his countrymen the Grecian philosophers who were badly neglected'.⁴ John Stuart Mill, in speaking of Plato, says 'there is scarcely anyone who, in this country at least, is not merely so little understood, but so little read. Our two great seats of learning bestow attention upon the various branches of classical acquirement in exactly the reverse order to that which would be observed by persons who valued the ancient authors for what is valued in them; namely, upon the mere niceties of the language first; next, upon a few of the poets; next (but at a great distance), some of the historians; next (but at a still greater interval), the orators; last of all, and just above nothing, the philosophers. If such be the neglect among those whose special duty it is to cultivate Plato, what can be expected from others?'⁵

May I now take you to the little village of Marlow in England in the years 1815-1817. We

shall find there a small group of devotees to Greek, self-styled 'The Athenians'. They passionately believed that Greek is the only remedy against the diseases and barbarities of the modern world. They called the passing of the seasons 'mere Atticism'. A list of the readings in Greek as appears in the Journals, letters and writings of these self-styled 'Athenians' is sufficient to remind even us professional classicists that we are living in the iron age of Greek. One of them, a lawyer, says: 'my larger ambition has two objects. To know all cases in Law and all words and authors in Greek.'⁶ He regrets that occasionally his law practice keeps him from bettering himself as an Athenian. The novels of another are filled with characters saying: 'Read ancient books, the only source of permanent happiness in this degenerate world.'⁷ The third, a poet, writes: 'I have employed Greek in large doses, and I consider it the only sure remedy for diseases of the mind.'⁸ The story of these Athenians, who are Shelley, Thomas Jefferson Hogg, Thomas Love Peacock, and Leigh Hunt, has just been published in *The Athenians, Being the Correspondence between Thomas Jefferson Hogg and his friends Thomas Love Peacock, Leigh Hunt, Percy Bysshe Shelley and others* (London, 1943). It constitutes a significant chapter in the contribution of the classics to Romantic literature.

The leader of these Athenians was Thomas Love Peacock, a novelist, a friend of Thomas Taylor, the eccentric Neoplatonist. He was responsible for helping to guide Shelley out of the confusion of revolutionary thought into the field

of classical beauty. Peacock formed an antidote to Godwinism which could not satisfy the innate idealism of Shelley's poetic nature, even though it might have satisfied Shelley the reformer. It was mostly the reading of the *Symposium* in the circle of these Athenians at Marlow that was responsible for this. Peacock was the initiator of Shelley into the Platonic cult. Peacock first read the *Symposium* in July 1817 and followed it by a poem called *Rhododaphne*, a Platonic allegory on Ouranios vs Pandemos Aphrodite. Shelley read the *Symposium* in August 1817; he followed it by an enthusiastic review of Peacock's *Rhododaphne* and shortly after that by a remarkably similar poem of his own entitled *Prince Athanase*, which contains these lines:

Then Plato's words of light in thee and me
Lingered like moonlight in the moonless east,
For we had just read—thy memory
Is faithful now—the Story of the Feast;
And Agathon and Diotima seemed
From death and dark forgetfulness released.

After the reading of the dialogue the love for Plato and the reading of his dialogues became an incandescent passion with Shelley. His *Journal*, letters, and his friends gave ample testimony that he read Plato continuously every year from 1817 to 1882, the year of his death. At the time when Plato was neglected, Shelley made him his god. 'I read Plato forever,' he writes, . . . 'Plato and Calderon have been my gods.'⁹ He read and translated him more than any poet of the English language. Plato was his constant companion both as a book and as living thought and poetry. In Plato he found a kindred soul, compact with all that he aspired to be. 'Plato,' he says, 'exhibits the rare union of close and subtle logic, with the Pythian enthusiasm of poetry, melted by the splendour and harmony of his periods, into one irresistible stream of musical impressions, which hurry the persuasion onward as in a breathless career. His language is that of an immortal spirit.'¹⁰ Shelley desired to be what he admired in Plato, and from his poetry and prose we can see how well he succeeded. This was not mere aspiration but the result of intensive reading. A list of his reading of Plato¹¹ would shame many a scholar. He read the *Eu-*

thyphro, *Laches*, *Theages*, *Parmenides*, *Cratylus*, *Gorgias*, *Timaeus*, *Laws*, the *Ion*; he saw Socrates die in the *Apology*, *Crito*, and *Phaedo*; he saw him live beautifully in the *Phaedrus*, and the *Symposium*. He spent many hours of his leisure in translating Plato. He translated the *Symposium*, the *Phaedo* (now lost), the *Ion*, fragments of the *Republic*, the *Menexenus*, and many of the epigrams of Plato. I wish now to call your attention to the translation of the *Symposium* and its contribution to the Platonic tradition.

When Shelley moved to Italy in 1818 he found himself, as he says, 'totally incapable of original composition.'¹² He chose, as was his usual custom, the exercise of translation as a stepping stone to poetic creation. Using the Bipont edition of Plato¹³ as his text, Shelley began the translation of the *Symposium* on July 9, 1818, devoting the mornings to the task. As Mary Shelley's *Journal* shows, the entire translation was the result of ten mornings' work, two of which were devoted to corrections. The speed of the translation shows that Shelley was already familiar with the text from the previous reading in 1817 and, as passages in the translation show, he made considerable use of Ficino's version when he was unable to understand the Greek. The translation was not a laborious, meticulous, plodding, and painstaking task, but a rapid, spirited, and vivid version. The translation of the *Symposium* was one of the most important things in Shelley's poetic life. The dialogue permeated Shelley's mind with its poetic and philosophic content. The allusions to it in his poetry and prose are unparalleled in number and importance, and most of Shelley's direct Platonism can be traced to this dialogue.

Sometime shortly after the completion of the translation Shelley wrote a preface to the translation. This preface is mainly a tribute to Plato's 'surpassing graces of the composition' and 'remarkable intuition.' The preface, however, breaks off in the midst of the beginning of an analysis of the dialogue. Shelley's failure to finish this preface is, no doubt, the result of his decision to write a different kind of introduction, one less conventional, and expressive of Shelley's desire to have Plato better understood by his con-

temporaries. This introduction was called 'A Discourse on the Manners of the Ancient Greeks Relative to the Subject of Love', which Shelley intended to be the introduction to his translation when it was published.

Though Shelley completed this essay and translated the whole of the *Symposium*, the publication of them in 1840 showed the essay as an incomplete fragment and many sections of the *Symposium* missing. Mary Shelley, who edited these for publication, falsified the facts when she stated that Shelley left them incomplete. The publication of the manuscripts several years ago shows them to be complete.¹⁴ Why, then, did Mary misrepresent the case? After the death of Shelley, Mary lost her intellectual courage and gave in to the British prejudice about the *Symposium*, which Shelley had set out to remove. In censoring both the essay and the translation, Mary was false to the intellectual honesty which characterized Shelley's attempt to have Plato understood by his contemporaries.

In Shelley's day Plato's *Symposium* was a very offensive work to British taste. We get a glimpse of the British aversion to this work in several statements of Shelley's friends. In Peacock's novel *Crotchet Castle* the Rev. Dr. Follott says: 'I am aware, sir, that Plato in his *Symposium* discourseth very eloquently touching the Uranian and Pandemian Venus; but you must remember that, in our Universities, Plato is held to be little better than a misleader of youth; and they show their contempt for him, not only by never reading him . . . but even by never printing a complete edition of him.'¹⁵

Keenly aware of this prejudice, Shelley took it as his duty to explain to Mary and all society the practice among the Greeks illustrated by the Alcibiades episode. In writing to Peacock on August 16 Shelley says: 'I am proceeding to employ myself on a discourse, upon the subject of which the *Symposium* treats, considering the subject with reference to the difference of sentiments respecting it, existing between the Greeks and modern nations: a subject to be handled with that delicate caution which either I cannot or I will not practice in other matters, but which here I acknowledge to be necessary.'¹⁶ With his characteristic intellectual courage, Shelley at-

tempts in the essay to have Plato understood in the context of his own time and own society. Recognizing the differences between the ancient and modern society on the subject of love, Shelley aimed at breaking down the barriers of misunderstanding. This is a prerequisite for any understanding of the *Symposium*. After an introduction, which is remarkable for the comprehensive statement of the legacy of Greece to civilization, Shelley proceeds in this essay to give to modern society 'a system of reasoning which,' he says, 'may enable the reader to form a liberal, consistent, and just judgment of the peculiarities of their domestic manners.' He concludes the essay with the statement: 'that this slight sketch was undertaken to induce the reader to cast off the cloak of his self-flattering prejudices and forbid the distinction of manners, which the author has endeavored to preserve in the translation of the ensuing piece, to interfere with his delight or his instruction.' The essay forms a good introduction to the subject and deserves recognition as a hitherto unknown effort in the Romantic movement to remove a prejudice in England which had prevented the Platonic tradition from becoming as enriching a tradition as it had been in the age of Spenser and Milton and as it was to be in the literature of England after Romanticism. For his frustrated effort to have the *Symposium* of Plato understood by his contemporaries, Shelley deserves praise and honorable mention in the Platonic tradition.

Shelley also deserves high praise for his translation. He speaks of the inadequacy of translation in words which give us an insight into his appreciation of the original. 'Sounds,' he says, 'as well as thoughts have relation both between each other and towards that which they represent, and a perception of the order of those relations has always been found connected with a perception of the order of those relations of thoughts. . . . Hence the vanity of translation; it were as wise to cast a violet into a crucible that you might discover the formal principle of its color and odor, as seek to transfuse from one language into another the creations of a poet.'¹⁷ Despite this acknowledged inadequacy of translation, Shelley was a prolific and a good translator; he was constantly translating great think-

ers
lati
(1)
ess
caus
satis
The
thre
lies
than
guar
mus
in o
that
latic
ing
in o
ley
no C
thos
that
the
tran
tran
as g
livin
by t
criti
poet
ofte
tran
into
poss
W
well
rors
not
of m
that
the c
son o
show
quer
lexic
could
use o
Shel
paris
show

ers and poets from all languages. All his translations reveal that Shelley took to translation: (1) in fallow periods to ignite the creative process in his own mind; (2) to advocate ideas and causes in which he believed; (3) to find aesthetic satisfaction in recreating from another language. The translation of the *Symposium* included all three reasons. The excellence of his translation lies in his conviction, 'there is no greater mistake than to suppose that the knowledge of a language is all that is required in a translator. He must be a poet and as great a one as his original in order to do justice to him.'¹⁸ Medwin records that Shelley was conscious of his talent for translation and once told him that he considered turning to translation in view of his lack of success in original composition. In his translation Shelley kept in mind the English reader who knew no Greek and said: 'translations are intended for those who do not understand the original, and that they should be purely English.'¹⁹ He is in the tradition of Stephen McKenna, the great translator of Plotinus, who says, 'the present translator has not thought of his probable readers as glossary-bound pedants but as possessed of the living vision which can follow a stream of thought by the light of its own vivid movement.'²⁰ The criterion of Shelley's translation is entirely poetic, revealing a poetic grasp which in its flight often outsoars strict textual accuracy. The translation reveals the keen insight which he had into Plato and which other translators, even if possessed of greater scholarship, lacked.

With respect to errors in his translation, it is well to keep in mind Jowett's remark about errors in his own translation. 'It is not that I do not *know* these elementary things; but the effort of making the English harmonious is so great that one's mind is insensibly drawn away from the details of the Greek.'²¹ A detailed comparison of Shelley's translation with the Bipont text shows that he knew Greek well but was frequently careless because of his aversion to the lexicon; he followed the Greek text where he could, but when he did not understand it he made use of Ficino's Latin version. A great many of Shelley's errors are not Shelley's own; a comparison of his translation with the Bipont text shows that many apparently meaningless sen-

tences and obvious errors are the result of transcription of Shelley's MSS by Mary, whose handwriting is difficult to decipher.²²

Yet what Shelley may have lost in accuracy he amply compensated in style of translation. Shelley's translation is, in accuracies apart, the best English version of the dialogue. Dowden says of it, that though 'not always exact in scholarship, it has much of the vivid life, the grace of movement, and luminous beauty of Plato.'²³ Leon Robin, one of the great Plato scholars of our day, pays unique tribute to Shelley's translation by using it as an aid in his own version for the Budé series.²⁴ Another tribute to Shelley's translation is seen in the fact that Paul Shorey uses it for quotation in *What Plato Said*.²⁵ A comparison of Shelley's version with those in his day, like Thomas Taylor's, which Coleridge described as: 'difficult Greek translated into incomprehensible English,'²⁶ shows that the difference is one of light and shadow. Mrs. Shelley is not exaggerating when she says of Shelley's version that: 'for the first time it introduces the Athenian to the English reader in a style worthy of him.'²⁷ In order to appreciate the truth of this statement one has only to read the translations of Plato in the abridgements of that period. A comparison of Shelley's version even with that of Jowett finds Shelley not without points of superiority. Shelley has great passages of prose transcending Jowett, who though a great scholar, is not the equal of Shelley in the felicity of the English language. Farrington says it is: 'not only in the more exalted passages, such as . . . the speeches of Agathon or Socrates in the *Symposium* that the superiority of Shelley over Jowett manifests itself; in lighter moments also he bears off the palm.'²⁸ He then cites the following comparison. 'Jowett: "Concerning the things about which you ask to be informed, I believe that I am not ill-prepared with an answer." Shelley: "I think that the subject of your enquiries is still fresh in my memory."' One might also cite Plato's οἶνος ἀνευ τε παίδων καὶ μετὰ παίδων (*Symposium* 217 e). Jowett renders this as "In vino veritas, whether with boys or without them." Shelley renders it: "Wine tells truth, whether with or without youth." Shelley's excellence in transmuting a scene, a mood, a

thought in appropriate rhythm is one of the distinguished features of his translation. It is these qualities, evident to one who has the Greek before him and compares the styles, which stamp Shelley's version, if not as the most accurate, at least as that which most re-creates in poetical prose many qualities of Plato's style. Shelley belongs to that rare class of English translators which is represented by Stephen McKenna. In calling Shelley a Platonist we must not neglect to enroll his name in the long list of those who have enriched the Platonic tradition *honoris causa*. In translating the *Symposium* he gave to the English readers a Plato they had not seen before; he anticipated by almost half a century the renaissance of Plato in England through Jowett's translation and Pater's studies. His translation of the *Symposium* presented to the Greekless reader of Plato 'the poetry of a philosopher rendered by the prose of a poet.'²⁰ For this service to the Platonic tradition (which is often forgotten) Shelley ranks as its radiant torch-bearer in English literature.

NOTES

¹ This paper was read at the Classical Association of New England held at Phillips Academy, Andover, Mass., March 28 and 29, 1947.

² G. Mure, 'Oxford and Philosophy,' *Philosophy*, XII (1937), 296-7.

³ *The Correspondence of Thomas Gray*, ed. by P. Toynbee and L. Whibley, (Oxford, 1935) III, 1295.

⁴ *Edinburgh Review*, XIV (1809), 189-90.

⁵ *The Monthly Repository*, New Series, VIII (1834), 89.

⁶ *The Athenians, Being Correspondence between Thomas Jefferson Hogg and his friends Thomas Love Peacock, Leigh Hunt, Percy Bysshe Shelley, and others*, Edited by Walter Sidney Scott (London, 1943), 37.

⁷ *The Halliford Edition of the Works of Thomas Love Peacock*, ed. by H. F. B. Brett-Smith and C. E. Jones (London, 1924-1934), II, 272.

⁸ The Julian Edition of *The Complete Works of Percy Bysshe Shelley*, Edited by Roger Ingpen and Walter E. Peck (London and New York, 1926-1929), VII, 311.

⁹ *Ibid.*, X, 334, 223.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, VII, 161-2.

¹¹ The evidence for this will be shown in a forthcoming book on Shelley and Plato.

¹² *The Julian Edition*, IX, 314.

¹³ *Platonis Philosophi, Quae Exstant, Graece Ad Editionem Henrici Stephani, Accurate Expressa, Cum Marsilii Ficini Interpretatione, Accedit Varietas Lectionis*,

Studiis, Societatis Bipontinae, Biponti, 1781-1787, 12 vols.

¹⁴ *Plato's Banquet, Translated from the Greek, A Discourse on the Manners of the Ancient Greeks Relative to the Subject of Love, Also a Preface to the Banquet*, Revised and enlarged by Roger Ingpen, From MSS in the possession of John C. E. Shelley-Rolls, Bart. Printed for private circulation, 1931. One hundred copies only, printed at the Curwen Press, Plaiston, London.

¹⁵ Halliford, *Works*, IV, 95.

¹⁶ Julian, *Works*, IX, 320.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, VII, 114.

¹⁸ T. Medwin, *Revised Life of Shelley*, ed. by H. B. Forman (London, 1913), 385.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 246.

²⁰ *Plotinus: The Ethical Treatises* (London and Boston, 1926), I, 115.

²¹ Quoted by B. Farrington in 'Shelley's Translations from the Greek,' *The Dublin Magazine*, III (1928), 9.

²² *Modern Language Review* XIV (1919), 325-6; *ibid.*, XXXIV (1939), 421-2; *Modern Language Notes*, LVI (1941), 536-41.

²³ E. Dowden, *The Life of Percy Bysshe Shelley* (London, 1886), II, 219.

²⁴ *Platon Oeuvres Complètes*, Tome IV, 2^e partie (Paris, 1924), Notice cxxi.

²⁵ P. Shorey, *What Plato Said* (Chicago, 1933), 45, 51.

²⁶ *Memorials of Coleorton*, Edited by W. Knight (Edinburgh, 1887), II, 107.

²⁷ Julian, *Works*, V, viii.

²⁸ *Dublin Magazine*, III (1928), 9.

²⁹ R. G. Grylls, *Claire Clairmont* (London, 1939), 98.

JAMES A. NOTOPOULOS

TRINITY COLLEGE

THE CLASSICS IN COLLEGE*

'Can we teach the Classics in English?' The question has doubtless become tiresome with treatment, and hypothetical through experience. For the answer seems to be that we are teaching the Classics in English, and that some of us have been doing so for many years with varying success. To raise the question now is to flout an old Roman proverb, of which Cicero approved—*acta agimus*. There are in fact today two well-marked roads in the study of our Classical tradition: the rugged, jarring, older road by way of Greek and Latin; and the newer, smoother route, the superhighway of translation.

We have struggled against increasing odds to keep the old road open: we congratulate ourselves that it is not as yet entirely blocked off; we admire and even flaunt our volatility in leap-

ing road-blocks which misologists devise and Philistines erect to halt our progress on the ancient way. Our joy and exultation is not, I fear, entirely a matter of the intellect. When the good of Greek and Latin is at stake, we sally forth as sentimentalists or zealots in a righteous cause. I would not deprecate our zeal or sentiment: it stems from a supreme abundance of refreshing, clear convictions. But if we recognize it as emotion, we may understand with greater charity and some benevolence the lack of this emotion in our critics.

They do not love, as we do, that ancient, rough, and winding road through Latin and through Greek: the sharp declivities of case construction, and the steep descents of verb inflection. They do not know, as we know, the subtle turns and hairpin curves of *-io* verbs and third declension adjectives. From long experience, we know just where the pavement ends, just where accusatives give way to ablatives or datives. When the going gets rough, we know which ruts to take, and we emerge successfully from tortuous, uneven passages of indirect discourse. We know what bridges we can trust, when *cum* or *dum* is safe and makes a sensible connection.

We like the scenery, too, on this old road: the *valles reductae* and the *colles aprici*, the cool, secluded valleys and the sunny hills, a little woods above, *paulum silvae super his*, and open fields; the languid villages and peaceful farms; hedges humming with the honey-bee, ever-running wells, and orchards blossom-fragrant in the early spring—the charming landscapes first revealed to us by Horace, Vergil, and Lucretius in their native tongue. This, we think, is truly the *via caelestis*, sometimes difficult and steep, *vel spinis horrentibus aspera vel saxis exstantibus impedita*, still in the end *plana et patens et omni genere florum atque fructuum delectabilis suavisque*.

The new road we regard as lacking interest and beauty. It is too straight: it skirts all the fascinating little places dozing in Italian sun; it by-passes all those pleasant views of sea and mountain glimmering in bright, Hellenic light. The new road is unexciting; it does not stir our senses; it does not tax our wits. It has no real

effect upon our characters: it involves no great adventure; it requires of us no ennobling courage or decision. It is indeed a path designed by Ceres' son-in-law, and fabricated by the gods below. It leads, if anywhere, to Tartarus and black night, which takes the color out of things.

Such is our feeling, a feeling born, we must admit, of long familiarity and past achievement on the ancient road. It is a warm and rich emotion, founded in reason but not altogether rational, incontestable perhaps, incommunicable certainly, and worth no more to us than the passion of our adversaries is to them. They contend with some reason too that the highway and the rocky road, initially divergent, are ultimately one. Their destination is the same: a certain understanding of our own traditions, surely a variety of that self-knowledge recommended by the Greeks, and celebrated in all humanistic teaching since the time of Socrates.

Our appeals for language study leave these critics undisturbed: eloquence, they say complacently, is not their aspiration; their concern is not with words but with ideas. For them the Classics are not grammars of linguistic science, but the texts of dialectic, in the sense that Plato understood it, as a study of the Good for man. In this connection they point directly to the Greeks as authors of magnificent rejections which we still endorse: Homer first impressed us with the tragedy of even righteous indignation; Aeschylus portrayed in vivid, everlasting tones the fatal pageantry of retribution; Thucydides detects, for once and all, the fallacy of interest as a measure of prosperity; while Plato boldly turns his back on mere experience as being pertinent to human happiness. The Romans, these critics tell us, are no less useful for being more assertive: they made majestic affirmations which we still accept: Lucretius first proclaimed science as a guide to conduct; Cicero has given us the first, clear, vigorous defense of duty; Vergil might be called the second Prince of Peace; and human freedom found in Tacitus a keen exponent, one whose ardor and acerbity remain unmatched. These concepts are the very core of Occidental ideology; and according to our critics, we can grasp them in English. They

argue that for years we have done this very thing with our religious heritage.

In addition, the new road saves time, they tell us: its travellers reach their destination sooner, and this is all-important in these days of haste and bustle and variety. Our affection for the back road, they say, is now eccentric, obsolete, and sentimental. For specialists, it is of course the only way; but the general student is obliged to spin along the broad, unswerving road. Furthermore, there are fewer accidents there! This spacious highway will accommodate the large increase in academic traffic. The old road would only multiply disaster for the newer vehicles and younger drivers, *praecinctis altius ac nos*.

And finally our adversaries would remind us that the new road was built by our own engineers; the Jowetts and Murrys and Mackails of our craft. Are we ready to repudiate their work? Why not continue it, building new lanes, improving others, and contriving safety measures for the mass of traffic which Translation Avenue may be required to support?

Can we reject this invitation to participate? I think not, if we have any genuine desire to promote or propagate our Classical traditions. If we refuse, less able engineers will certainly be summoned to the task. Accordingly, we must pick up our instruments, survey the newer route again, and set to work. *Sic nos Apollo servet!*

NOTE

*A paper read at the Forty-first Annual Meeting of the Classical Association of the Atlantic States held at the University of Pittsburgh on April 23 and 24, 1948.

VAN JOHNSON

TUFTS COLLEGE

HORACE, SATIRES 1.1.86-91

miraris, cum tu argento post omnia ponas,
si nemo praestet, quem non merearis, amorem?
at si cognatos, nullo natura labore
quos tibi dat, retinere velis servareque amicos,
infelix operam perdas, ut si quis asellum
in campo doceat parentem currere frenis.

My text is that of several good MSS, my punctuation that of Schütz. I interpret as follows: In lines 80-3 is stated the miser's argument that money is a kind of insurance against illness: a man with money will have friends to care for

him and can get a physician to restore him to his beloved children and neighbors. Horace replies (84-5) that as a matter of fact the miser's wife and son are not interested in his health, and he is hated by his neighbors, acquaintances, and by boys and girls. In the following two lines Horace asks: 'Are you surprised, seeing that you give money precedence over all else, if no one shows you the affection which you do not deserve?' At this point, and quite in keeping with the elliptical and conversational style of the satire, we can readily imagine the miser's objection: 'How can you say that I don't deserve the love of my family and friends? For what earthly reason would I be making money hand over fist if not so as to please those dear to me, to give them security, independence, luxury, power—in short, to make them happy?' Horace meets or anticipates this objection with the rebuttal (88-91: I paraphrase): 'But just let us suppose that your object in making money is to keep the affection of your kinsfolk—whom, after all, Nature gives you without any effort on your part!—and to hold on to your friends,—even on that supposition you're making a sad waste of your efforts. It's just as if a man were to teach an ass to obey the reins and run in the field like a horse.' *Velis* and *perdas* are subjunctive in an ideal supposition. The clause, *nullo . . . dat*, is Horace's own parenthesis and conveys the thought: 'You don't have to try to keep what Nature gives you *gratis*, but you do have to try not to throw it away by failing to reciprocate in kind, simple affection for simple affection.' *Infelix operam perdas*: 'making money is not a formula for keeping the affection of one's family.'

At si quis . . . frenis: I believe that scholars have been misled by the Scholiasts' interpretation of this comparison. As long as one is committed to the notion that this is a simple proverbial expression for attempting the impossible, one is bound to find the whole passage a bad tangle. Three scholars—to my knowledge—broke with the traditional interpretation but failed to discover an acceptable application of the comparison (Moriz Mezger, *Beitrag zur Erklärung des Satiren des Horatius* (Augsburg 1866); Doederlein, as cited by Mezger 5; Tycho

Mom
Satir
Mezg
of th
lecte
prov
eigh
solut
3) 61
Ch
versi
(269
Code

Ar
an
ow
an
ac
wi
th
an
of
sw
T
T
ri
of
w
m

Amo
the
ἀμαθ
ger's
vol.
πρὸς
Otto
reve
=Me
pret
ἀσμε
ἦ εἰς
shou
bove
T
Aes
nan
mise
mak
to h

Mommsen, *Bemerkungen zum ersten Buche des Satiren des Horaz* [Frankfurt-am-Main 1871] 7). Mezger's *Program* has a usefulness independent of the interpretation which he offers, for he collected many passages and about eighty-three proverbs about asses. (Mezger's ninth and eighty-first proverbs are the same: see Einarson's solution of Hor. *Epist.* 1.20.14-6 at CJ 28 (1932-3) 611, and correct TLL s. v. 'asellus' 779.61-2.)

Chambry (*Aesop. Fab.*, Budé) presents three versions of a fable entitled *ὄνος ἵππον μακαρίζων* (269). The third of these, contained only in the Codex Bodleianus, is the fullest. I translate:

An ass felicitated the horse on his provender and grooming. And he bewailed himself and his own lot, seeing that he carried heavy burdens and had little provender, whereas the horse was accoutred with bridle and frontlets and ran with a light burden. As he was reflecting on this, a war broke out, and the soldier with his arms mounted the horse and rushed into the midst of the foe. And the horse, surrounded by swords, lay wounded and breathing his last. The ass changed his mind and pitied the horse. The moral is that we ought not to envy the rich and powerful, but, taking due consideration of the envy and danger that accrue to them, we ought to be satisfied with poverty, the mother of peace.

Among Mezger's list of proverbs about asses are the following: *ὄνος ἵππον μιμούμενος: ἐπὶ τῶν ἀμαθῶς τινα ζηλούντων* (Macar. 6.32) (I copy Mezger's references for Leutsch and Schneidewin, vol. 2). *Ἀπ' ὄνον ἐφ' ἵππους: ἐπὶ τῶν ἀπὸ μικρῶν πρὸς μείζω χωρούντων* (Diogenian., Vindob. 1.55=Otto 42). The terms of this proverb might be reversed ('from horses to asses': Zenob. 2.33, etc.=Mezger 42) and the resultant proverb interpreted as follows: *ἐπὶ τῶν ἀπὸ τῶν σεμνῶν ἐπὶ τὰ ἄσεμνα ἰκόντων: οἷον ἀπὸ γραμματικῶν ἐπὶ πραγματικῶν, ἢ εἰς ἄλλο τι τῶν ἀτιμοτάτων*. To this group we should add Plautus, *Aulularia* 235: *ab asinis ad boves transcendere*.

The reference of these proverbs, as of the Aesopian fable, is to change in one's status, financial, social, or the like. The mistake that the miser would be making if he argued that he is making money so as to give greater happiness to his family and friends involves the same bad

reasoning that the ass used when he supposed that the horse was better off than he himself was. Let the miser heap wealth and power upon his family: he will be doing them no greater favor than a man would be doing if he tried to promote the ass to the status of a horse. Doederlein, Mezger, and T. Mommsen thought that there must be a comparison between the ass's stubbornness or supposed reluctance to wear the bridle and learn to run, and the family's inability to believe in the sincerity of the miser if after a life of moneymaking he should suddenly pretend that it was their interests he had at heart all the time. But the ass is not incredulous, and the family is not stubborn. I believe that the illustration is limited to the question whether happiness is enhanced by a change in status. Horace uses the same idea at *Epistles* 1.14.43-4:

optat ephippia bos, piger optat arare caballus:
quam scit uterque, libens, censebo, exerceat artem

If my interpretation solves the difficulty in the passage under discussion, it may also tie up this passage with the satire as a whole. If the miser argues that he must make money so as to shower benefits upon his friends—well, says Horace, we know that isn't true; but, just supposing it were true, we can easily demonstrate the futility of his efforts in that direction. For this desire to rise in the social scale, to be rich and powerful, is identical with that general disease which we announced as the subject of our satire: the notion which every man entertains that if only he could trade places with somebody else he would be much happier. The ass in the fable thought he would be better off if he were a horse—but he found out how mistaken he had been. The miser's friends and family may fancy the glitter of social and financial distinction; but let the miser heap wealth upon them and they will soon be so disillusioned that they will be unable to feel grateful affection for their so-called benefactor. For their changed status would only increase their worries, take them out of their proper orbit and put them into a faster life with greater duties and liabilities.

ties and less of the natural life, with its ready exchange of genuine affection.

EDWARD BOUCHER STEVENS

MUHLENBERG COLLEGE

REFLECTIONS OF HISTORY IN THE DECLAMATIONS

The question of realism in the declamations has not been neglected; indeed, because unreality was recognized, even by contemporaries and practitioners, as characteristic of the majority of scholastic themes, most defenders of their professional utility have felt obliged to point out exceptions. Bornecque, who devotes a chapter to the laws in the *controversiae*, calls attention to the probability of an unproved legal basis for some declamations¹ and the awareness of current legislation displayed in others.² Cousin's study of Quintilian, though it treats more fully the fictional laws and themes, justifies in several instances what have been generally regarded as errors or inventions of the rhetoricians.³ A less restricted point of view is taken by other writers, who have sought to discern a relation between the school themes and the social conditions of the Empire. Deratini, for example, refers to Tacitus's account of trials for poisoning and the hostility of Livia toward Germanicus as illustrating the real-life basis for declamations dealing with murders by poison and enmity between stepmother and stepson; other themes (tyrants, kidnapping, pirates, sale to slave dealers, etc.) he traces to a Greek background which had been contemporaneously mirrored in Middle Comedy.⁴ Parks, in a very recent work on the schools of rhetoric, after emphasizing the evils of divorce, infidelity, poisoning, intrigue, and prostitution which philosophers of the Empire moralized about, historians recorded, and satirists censured, concludes that declamatory themes must have differed from reality, if they differed at all, more in form than in matter.⁵

It would be surprising if the listing of realistic matter from this more general standpoint were exhaustive, and in my opinion it is not. I shall touch upon two themes completely passed over in all discussions which I have read. The 302nd of pseudo-Quintilian's *Declamationes Minores* is

a defence of a man barred from sitting in the first fourteen rows, on the ground that he was an ex-gladiator. The circumstances set forth in the statement of the case are as follows: he had hired himself out as a gladiator in order to raise the money to bury his father; on the day of the show he appeared wearing a placard which indicated the reason for his action, and the people clamored so loudly for his discharge that he was dismissed without actually having fought. The case is of that type so familiar and so dear to the rhetoricians, a matter for definition, in which, as Quintilian writes, the alleged behavior is not denied but palliated.⁶ The advocate argues that the accuser's use of terms is too broadly inclusive, and that a gladiator is one who has fought in the arena with a sword while a crowd looked on; this the defendant is not, any more than one is a lawyer who has not pleaded a case, or an accuser who has not brought a man to trial. The trainers, doctors, and attendants in the gladiatorial school, he maintains, are not looked upon as gladiators. His client's reason for putting himself under contract redounds to his credit; the accuser, however, would have censured Cimon for taking his father's place in prison. But the defendant hoped for the people's favor and did not expect to have to fight. His subsequent mode of life is adequately shown by his acquisition of a knight's property status.

Everyone remembers from his reading of Martial how jealously the privilege of a seat in the first fourteen rows was treasured and how often it was fraudulently claimed. Not improbably, legal redress was sometimes sought for unwarranted exclusion. Again, in an age when senators degraded themselves to the status of clients, an ordinary citizen might well have sold himself into bondage as a gladiator. The particular combination of circumstances described in the declamation is a bit too pat to be probable, but the elements of which it is compounded are realistic and topical enough, taken singly; the ingenuity of the rhetoricians is neatly demonstrated by precisely this mode of treatment.

Another case from the same collection has no apparent relationship to a Roman background—is, in fact, one of those themes dealing with

tyrants which are so universally described by critics ancient and modern as being of Greek inspiration. In this exercise a rich young man who has harbored disinherited sons and supported them from his own purse is accused of injury to the state; the import of the charge is plainly treasonable design. The defence, of course, asserts that the accused has at worst only squandered his money, that he was doing nothing but aid the needy and unfortunate, that the change from prosperity to sudden adversity might have driven the disinherited to crimes of violence, and that their mode of life and his are marked by sobriety, frugality, and modesty.

True, Quintilian differentiates the *abdicati* of the declamations from the *exhereditati* of Roman law, since ἀποκίρησις in Athens and countries of Greek culture extinguished the *patria potestas* as disinheritance did not,⁷ but the basic situation is unaffected by the technicality. Putting this in Roman terms, could not Julius Caesar's enemies have leveled the same charge against him? Suetonius, who bore no partisan antipathy, says of Caesar:

Tum reorum, aut obaeratorum, aut prodigae iuventutis, subsidium unicum ac promptissimum erat, nisi quos gravior criminum vel inopiae luxuriaeve vis urgeret, quam ut subveniri posset a se; his plane palam bello civili opus esse dicebat.⁸

Do not Cicero and Sullust charge Catiline with having attached desperate young profligates to his cause by immediate aid and promises of revolutionary change? The rival bands of Clodius and Milo show how widespread the recruiting of supporters to effectuate personal ambitions had become in the last century of the Republic. Perusal of the elder Seneca's themes for declamation will indicate that events and personages of this period figure importantly in the rhetorical exercises; the epic of Lucan, also the handbooks on oratory point to continuing interest in the same subject matter, and make it more than plausible that the disorders which sprang from the quest for absolute power at Rome lent point and parallel to the Greek-derived declamations concerning tyrants.

NOTES

¹ Les Déclamations et les Déclamateurs d'après

Sénèque le Père', Lille Université, Travaux et Memoires, Droit et Lettres, (Lille, 1902), 69-70. The school law *Rapta raptoris aut mortem aut indotatas nuptias optet* he terms a fusion of usage, whereby parents ordinarily consented to marriage, and law, punishing rape by death; the ban against a lewd person or thief attending a public assembly, though not discovered in specific enactments, he treats as likely.

² *Ibid.*, 71-2: legalization of slaying of both parties to adultery; immediacy enjoined by failure to specify time for performance; retention of part of dowry by husband convicting his wife of adultery.

³ Jean Cousin, *Étude sur Quintilien* (Paris, 1936), 695 (right of husband before enactment of *Lex Iulia* to kill wife caught in adultery); 700 (limitation of legatee's claim, in case there was a single heir, to more than half of the property left by deceased).

⁴ 'Le Réalisme dans les Déclamations', *Revue de Philologie*, 1929, 185-9.

⁵ Bro. E. Patrick Parks, *The Roman Rhetorical Schools as a Preparation for the Courts under the Early Empire*, in *The Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science* (Series LXIII, No. 2, 1945), 40-1.

⁶ *Inst. Or.*, VII. 3. 1.

⁷ *Ibid.*, VII 4. 11.

⁸ *Julius* 27.

CHARLES S. RAYMENT

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

EXPLORING THE WINDS WITH THE FACE

An interesting bit of sea lore is to be found in Vergil, *Aeneid* 3.513-4:

Haud segnis strato surgit Palinurus et omnis
Explorat ventos atque auribus aëra captat.

In *The Classical Weekly*, 10 (1916), 24, Professor Pearl Wilson explains that these lines have to do with a method of determining the direction of the wind that is still in use among seafaring men.

'If you hold your head so that the wind comes straight into one ear, and then turn it slowly till it is blowing with equal force in both ears, you will find yourself then facing it directly.'

A few years later I quoted in the same journal, 13, (1920), 219, a passage from Kipling's *Captains Courageous*, Chapter V, that has some bearing on this subject. It runs as follows:

'He [Dan, the captain's son] could steer in anything short of half a gale from the feel of the wind on his face, humouring the *We're Here* just when she needed it.'

It would seem that the entire face would aid

the ears in getting the feel of the wind. At all events, it may be worth while to associate with the Vergilian quotation three excerpts from American books:

'The night was cold—so cold that my neck ached and my muscles seemed made of wood. A heavy mist hung low over the water, thrusting clammy fingers against our flesh and through our garments. Rogers, a towering figure in the stern of our boat, explored the air currents with his beak of a nose, seeming to feel them as an animal might.'—Kenneth Roberts, *Northwest Passage* (New York, 1937), p. 113.

'Aquarius Wharff believed—and his townsmen agreed—that as a weather-vane he was distinctly serviceable to Palermo. He would inveigh against the inaccuracy of the dingy, rusty arrow on the Union Meeting-house, and then would perk his nose into the wind, and rotate himself on his wavering leg to show his own superior manageability.'—Holman Day, *Squire Phin* (New York, 1913), p. 6.

'This steering by the nose, Magnet, may do well enough for an Indian, but your thorough-bred knows the virtues of the needle.'—James Fenimore Cooper, *The Pathfinder* (Everyman's Library, 1906), p. 11.

It may be pertinent to note that in a storm at sea a captain tries to keep his ship's nose pointed into the wind.

EUGENE S. MCCARTNEY

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

THE CASE OF LATIN ON APPEAL*

When a case is presented to the jury, it is the duty of the judge to instruct the members of the jury on the law as it applies to the facts of the case. If the judge in this instruction, makes any palpable misinterpretations of legal principles, the court of appeals orders the lower court to send the record to it on a writ of *certiorari*. This term is, as you recognize, an infinitive of the Latin verb *certiorare*, which means 'to inform'. The Court of Appeals then reviews the case and if, for example, competent evidence has been excluded by the lower court which should have been admitted, the Court of Appeals will reverse the judgment of the lower court and send it back with a *procedendo* (Gerund of *procedere*), which is an order to proceed again with retrial of the case.

There is a great difference between ancient Roman and American courts in the matter of appeal. In ancient times when a party to a suit

was convicted or otherwise lost his case, there was no such thing as another trial in a higher court. When the case was adjudged, that was the end so far as the courts were concerned. In the State of New York today, the highest court is known as the Court of Appeals. Our petitioner, *Latin*, must be given justice. We shall now review the facts and evidence of its case on appeal.

Let us as teachers of Latin, consider ourselves in the position of the judge of an American court; let us suppose that our students are the jury. Just as the judge instructs the jury concerning matters of law, let us instruct our students in Latin because of its intrinsic value, as sound academic training. There is no one subject in the academic curriculum of the secondary schools which has so much to offer as have four years of Latin. We teachers of Latin know this from experience. From personal experience I know how basic it has been to me throughout college and in graduate school while studying French, Spanish, and Italian, and in law school. In all the courses that I have had many references have been made to Roman Law, and of course, many of the terms are Latin. (*common law pleading, contracts, agency, partnership, legal bibliography, torts, property, both real and personal, equity, creditor's rights, evidence*) It is possible for one to learn these subjects without a knowledge of Latin, but I am convinced that academic pursuits without a solid foundation in Latin are comparable to a meatless dinner or a diet of milk toast—one may thrive, but the zest and luscious flavors are lacking. We teachers of Latin know this, but we must prove it to our students beyond a reasonable doubt, not just by a preponderance of evidence, but by clear, concise, and indubitable evidence. Our problem is: How can we make students realize this, so that they will want to take Latin in preference to some of the electives which often just help to fill in the required number of hours per week? Our compulsory education laws require children to remain in school until a certain age, but a high school should not be an academic jail, where students are falsely imprisoned until freed by age or by writ of *habeas corpus*,

otherwise known as the diploma. A good knowledge of Latin is a potent vitamin for strengthening academic tissues; it is the uranium of the cranium. Latin is one subject in the curriculum that can never be adjudicated a bankrupt; its assets are liquidated and can at all times be distributed upon request to its petitioning creditors, namely, the other courses of study. Let us teachers of Latin see to it that there is no misrepresentation or concealment of facts. Let us bring out from personal experience every bit of material relevant to the issue and lay it before our students. Sometimes teacher-personality is rated too high in proportion to training in method and subject matter; by the same token both extremes are bad, and one without the other is ineffective; they must be complementary, or as Horace suggested, *aurea mediocritas*. Teen-agers are more discerning than we sometimes realize; they will pour some of their vivacity into something—even classical—if they think it worthwhile: their interest won't have to be subpoenaed. Oh yes, some students are as difficult to reach as the birds of Stymphalus and their interest as difficult to capture as the Cerynian stag, but once they experience the benefits and pleasures to be derived from studying Latin, we won't have to resort to the trickery of Ulysses or to the magic of Medea. However, we must have the subject matter and several methods of presentation at our disposal. We must readily sense the attitude of the class, the calibre, and their mood just as they do readily detect ours. We just have to beat them to the draw, call a card, and begin the attack.

The first day the student enters the classroom, he is very attentive, if only out of curiosity. *Carpe diem!* This is the time to capture his interest and hold it. Greet him in Latin; call him by his Latin name. Right then activity begins; his mind alert, curious, and challenged, grasps, retains, and responds proportionately to the enthusiasm and sincerity of the teacher and the teacher's *modus agendi*. Call his attention to the Latin all about him, not by hear-say evidence, but by direct proof. I strongly believe that an assignment should be made that first day. Set the pace then; students like to be

kept busy; as Cicero would put it, it keeps that unbridled audacity from displaying itself. An assignment is not a punishment, but an opportunity to learn something new. A student's relative achievement is measured by the quantity and quality of information so taught that it impresses him and inspires him with a genuine pleasure of just plain learning. We do not have to try to make Latin easy to learn, but a pleasure to learn; it is a privilege to know. Reliable textbooks prevent unnecessary confusion in the student's mind. We are fortunate in Yeadon to have at the helm of our district, co-operative school board members and administrators. They have always granted any request made in the interest of progress, such as requests for textbooks, workbooks, films, and reference books for the library. A pre-test is given to help guide the student in selecting a foreign language. These favorable conditions are the *go* sign; from there we begin. By the way, the geographical background of Yeadon offers itself as a vicarious experience to students of the so-called dead language. Within the boundaries of our borough are three cemeteries. Yeadon has the unique distinction of being the only town in the entire county that has more population dead than alive; its approaches resemble the Appian Way! With a setting like that, you can understand that in studying Latin, my students are just 'doing what comes naturally'.

The first day in the second-year Latin class this year, after a brief outline of the work to be accomplished and some remarks in reference to the text and how to use it, I told the students to translate as much as they could; that I was going to keep a daily record of their progress. The second day, upon checking, I found that there were four who translated seventy lines of the first unit in the book (*Ancient and Modern Travel*). Can you imagine the results if we commanded seventy lines of translation the first day of school? There would be a secession comparable to that of the plebs in the 5th Century, B.C., and as many parents would come in person to object as assembled for Orgetorix on the day of his trial. Throughout Unit 1, I kept a daily

record of individual achievement. In this way, the slower ones do not retard the faster ones and the spirit of rivalry and personal progress serve as incentives to work to capacity. With practice the students translate with greater facility; he likes to do that which he can do. The better he likes it, the more he does, and the more he does, the more he learns. *Res ipsa loquitur*. This idea can also be carried out in the advanced class. A graph can be made showing each student where he ranked in the beginning, just how much progress he has made, and how consistent his efforts have been. Individual differences are cared for in this way and doing the Latin assignment is pleasure rather than drudgery because the individual's *will to learn* is the best motivation.

Our second-year course is divided into 5 units—Ancient and Modern, tourists, Ulysses, Hercules, the Argonauts and Caesar. When we are well into the reading of the Gallic Wars, each student makes a project. Since this practice has become a tradition over a period of ten years, there is a keen interest and effort to accomplish a worthwhile, thorough, and accurate project. The student selects some phase from the unit which interests him most, talks over the proposed project with me. In this way I can offer help and prevent repetition. To aid the student in developing his topic, many books are placed at his disposal. He therefore reads as much as he can before undertaking the task. Much of the work is done in connection with other departments in the school, e.g., the Art Department, Music, Shop. On the date set for the completion of the project, each student presents his to the class, with a full explanation. All students benefit mutually from the work done. It is surprising and inspiring to see what they can do. Some of the projects are: A Roman house, the Claudian aqueduct perfectly sealed and really quite a fete of engineering, the Circus Maximus, a Roman bireme about 3 feet long, a theatre with puppets; the script taken from Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*, many implements of warfare, including a phalanx, movable tower, ballista, splendid drawings and paintings of the Appian Way, Phaethon, origi-

nal illustrations of the unit on the Argonauts, and of the story of Hercules, a model of Rome, dolls of different periods of Roman history, the invasion of Britain, a Roman store, the temple of Vesta, the Parthenon, a Roman camp, the Roman Senate and the denunciation of Catiline. Artfully draped clothes' pins were used to represent senators. A Roman road in its several stages of construction is shown, a reasonable facsimile of Medea, and several others. Original stories have been submitted by those whose talents are in that direction, and reports on medicine and first aid, have been made by those aspiring to the medical profession. After all the projects are in, then we have Latin project week; the entire school is invited to see the exhibit. Each article is labelled and explained so that the tour is an instructive one for non-Latin as well as for Latin students. These projects make excellent visual aids for teaching the successors in interest, the heirs of Latin.

You probably have a school night or exhibition night. It is rather difficult to display a foreign language, but it would be inequitable to deprive so worthy a client of his just rights. One year we made recordings of the Latin I class and of the Vergil class, in which a student gave an introductory explanation of the *Aeneid*, the purpose of the story. Then selected parts were translated and the class read it together in hexameter. Attention was called to the figures of speech used in the particular passage. The records for Latin I, III and IV, and the projects of Latin II may by our judge be classified as exhibits 'A', 'B', and 'C', and introduced as evidence that Latin was acting within the sphere of its authority and in no way guilty of negligence. This evidence discloses that the scales of justice would be tipped into an equitable balance by a judicial decree of *nolle pros*. (Which stands for *nolle prosecute*, meaning 'be unwilling to prosecute', or withdrawal of the prosecution).

Over the door of the main library of the University of Pennsylvania are the words 'Talkers are no great doers.' My mother used to say, 'if you're no planner, you're no doer.' Just talking about what the Romans did and what

they
purp
and h
can t
tory
of ju
ennia
fully
mala
is his
form
printe
are w
The e
jects.
have
they
have
Latin
tory,
nomics
Englis
banque
Shakes
Ninety
the pri
ers als
ertain
in one
manne
centrat
period
Duri
have a
ent me
to atte
Benjam
in 194
to the
during
these f
were v
If w
a direc
it is
recorde
Let
there a

they wore and what they ate can serve two purposes: It can give the students a background and better understanding of these people, or it can turn the Latin period into an ancient history class—of this I do not approve. So instead of just talking about these things, we plan biennially a Roman banquet, observing as carefully as possible all details, *ab ovo usque ad mala*. Each student has a special part, and it is his duty to do outside reading in order to perform his function correctly. The tickets are printed in Latin, so are the menus. Costumes are worn and prizes are awarded for the best. The entertainment is correlated with other subjects. The 10th grade boys, wearing togas, have presented portions of *Julius Caesar* which they were reading in English class; the girls have presented a quiz program to show how Latin is used in other subjects—in science, history, music, physical education, art, home economics, mathematics, Romanic languages, and English. The juniors and seniors at the latest banquet presented 'Pryamus and Thisbe' from Shakespeare's *Midsummer Night's Dream*. Ninety-six students attended our last banquet; the principal, superintendent, and several teachers also attended. This activity is not only entertaining, but teaches more students more facts in one evening in an impressive and effective manner than I could do in three weeks of concentrated lecturing on the subject. The Latin period is devoted to *learning the Latin language*.

During the past ten years my students and I have attended many functions such as this present meeting. The Vergil class earned the money to attend the Classical Society Banquet at the Benjamin Franklin Hotel in Philadelphia back in 1940. Our advanced class went (last year) to the sky-show given at the Fels Planetarium during Latin week. We were entertained by these functions, yes, but at the same time we were vividly instructed.

If we teachers were the judge, we would order a directed verdict in favor of Latin. However, it is preferable to have a favorable verdict recorded by the jury, our students.

Let FAMA, who pricks up as many ears as there are feathers in her body, proclaim in her

nation-wide hook up, this slogan:—LSMFT—Latin Study Means Fine Training.

After reviewing the evidence, I am sure all will agree with me on a *per curiam* decision, which denotes that there is no dissenting opinion and Latin wins its case on appeal.

JULIA FINNEY

* Paper read before the Autumn Meeting of the Classical Association of the Atlantic States held in New York City in November 1946.

HIGH SCHOOL

YEADON, PENNSYLVANIA

Aspects of the Ancient World. By VICTOR EHRENBURG. ix, 256 pp. (New York, William Salloch, 1946) \$4.50.

This collection of essays, reviews, lectures by Victor Ehrenberg, who was formerly Professor of Ancient History at Prague University and now lectures at one of the colleges affiliated with the University of London, spans two entire decades. The selection, made by the author himself, embraces scholarly papers, complete with an apparatus of notes and citations, as well as articles of a more general nature that should appeal to a literate reading public. Most of the material has been published in Germany, Czechoslovakia, and England; some are expanded university addresses and broadcasts.

The very character of the totality of contents precludes a rigidly sequential unity. But the book has a larger, more spacious unity in the general sweep and vision of its historical approach. There is, as an introduction, a survey of the beginnings of European history, followed by an analysis of the Greek state, an examination of historical criticism in terms of Greek history, analogies between the ancient world and the European scene, a lucid topical critique of the totalitarian state with Sparta as the corpus vile and, among a miscellany of equally appealing matter, appreciations of Alexander the Great and, at the other extreme, the historian Eduard Meyer.

A commendable and unusual feature, evident throughout, is a certain freshness of treatment, a sense of topicality that, far from being over-

whelmed by the weight of scholarly equipment, uses that material pliantly, realistically. In *The Beginnings of European History*—which was basically Professor Ehrenberg's Inaugural Lecture—a historical synthesis is attempted, reaching the expected conclusion that the function of the historiographer of ancient times, in order to clarify the European past and to embrace an over-all historical view, must utilize a variety of types of ancillary disciplines—archaeological, epigraphic, linguistic—but that such an overestimate of history must not imply a foundation for a formal philosophical outlook. Historical scholarship, asserts Dr. Ehrenberg, must be satisfied with its own self-imposed prescriptions. This entire discussion, without adding much that is new in itself, is individually presented, argued cogently. Again, Dr. Ehrenberg, stressing the inherent unity of European culture, demonstrates that this unity, stemming from the East and, as it were, passing through strata of Far Eastern and Middle East Cultures, entered Europe through the intercession of Greece.

Greece thus acted as the catalyst of this Eastern culture, transmitting it, along with its own contribution in the political field, to the West.

In conformity with this view, Dr. Ehrenberg examines Greek civilization, its peculiar geographical status, and its development of the *polis*—which, although never reaching complete identity with the community, still acted as an intense, continuous stimulant to later historical periods. In the essay on Alexander the emphasis is likewise on the linking of East to West, Alexander being characterized as the first cosmopolitan, as 'the founder of the first territorial and absolute monarchy which grew from the soil of the Western world.'

In other chapters Dr. Ehrenberg, even when dealing with the minutiae of scholarship, lifts his argument to a humanistic plane that, but for the fact that Dr. Ehrenberg himself deprecates the expression, might be termed, without any pejorative sense, *Historismus*.

HARRY E. WEDECK

ERASMUS HALL

Second-Hand Books
in
LATIN AND GREEK
and
WORKS RELATING TO CLASSICAL ANTIQUITY
BOUGHT AND SOLD

Catalogs Issued
WILLIAM H. ALLEN
Bookseller

2031 Walnut Street

Philadelphia 3, Pa.